	Case 1:22-cv-00805-JLT-SAB Docume	ent 9 Filed 08/23/22 Page 1 of 2
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	CARLOS MARTINEZ,	No. 1:22-cv-00805-JLT-SAB-HC
12	Petitioner,	ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
13	v.	RECOMMENDATIONS, DISMISSING PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS WITHOUT PREJUDICE, AND DIRECTING CLERK OF COURT TO SEND PETITIONER PRISONER CIVIL RIGHTS COMPLAINT
1415	SECRETARY OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION,	
16	Respondent.	(Doc. 7)
17		
18	The magistrate judge issued Findings and Recommendations, recommending the petition	
19	for writ of habeas corpus be dismissed because Petitioner's claim is not cognizable in federal	
20	habeas corpus and declining to convert the petition as a civil rights complaint. (Doc. 7.) Petitioner	
21	filed timely objections. (Doc. 8.) Petitioner agrees with the Findings and Recommendations that	
22	he should have raised his claim in a § 1983 action. (Id. at 1.) However, Petitioner requests the	
23	Court convert this matter to a Section 1983 civil rights action and "permit Petitioner to file an	
24	Amended Civil Rights Complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 which is attached to these objections."	
25	(<i>Id.</i> at 2.)	
26	The Court notes Petitioner did not, in fact, attach a proposed complaint to the objections.	
27	However, as the magistrate judge observed, this action was not "amenable to conversion on its	
28	face" by the Court. (See Doc. 7 at 1-2, citing Nettles v. Grounds, 830 F.3d 922, 936 (9th Cir.	
		1

1	2016), Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 676 (2009).) Furthermore, the exhaustion requirements		
2	for a civil rights claim differ, and the action would be subject to the three-strike rule of the Prison		
3	Litigation Reform Act. (Id. at 2.) Accordingly, the Court declines to simply convert this action		
4	to one under Section 1983, though Plaintiff may choose to initiate a civil action.		
5	According to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), the Court conducted a <i>de novo</i> review of the case		
6	Having carefully reviewed the entire file—including Petitioner's objections—the Court holds the		
7	Findings and Recommendations to be supported by the record and proper analysis. Thus, the		
8	Court ORDERS:		
9	1.	The Findings and Recommendations issued on July 26, 2022 (Doc. 7) are	
10		ADOPTED.	
11	2.	The Clerk of Court is DIRECTED to send Petitioner a prisoner civil rights	
12		complaint form.	
13	3.	The petition for writ of habeas corpus is DISMISSED without prejudice to refiling	
14		the claim in a civil action brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.	
15			
16	IT IS SO ORD		
17	Dated: A	August 22, 2022 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
18		Office States district Joboe	
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
20			

Case 1:22-cv-00805-JLT-SAB Document 9 Filed 08/23/22 Page 2 of 2